IMAC Training and Technical Assistance
Meeting Minutes – September 21, 2004

Present: Tricia Bless, Jeff Brikowski, Lynda Fischer, Eric Gibson, Jenny Hoffman, Stacia Jankowski, Julie Loebel, Amy Mendel-Clemens, Kevin Raines, Margaret Romens, Deb Solis, Staci Wanty, Russell Yancey

Current Distance learning initiatives – update and feedback (EVP, RCR 2b)

Change Reporting IIB is at 84% completion
Employer Verification has had no change from last meeting when it was 38% enrolled and 31% completed. The impact of not completing this training has not yet been determined.

Electronic Case File – initiative update including feedback from the pilots.

ECF training - estimate 35 staff in Milwaukee still having trouble. Difficulty with WAMS and the number of passwords staff need to maintain. This experience at the beginning can taint the learning process.
The pilot phase of this project is just beginning and will continue through the end of the year.
In nonpilot counties, a "super user" may need to be identified to deal with cases that transfer in.
Dane Co. is in process of hooking up now. This committee would like to see a demonstration at the next meeting.

WislineWeb report – how did it go?

20 counties were previously unrepresented at the Quarterly Training Update WislineWeb sessions. Before the last meeting specialized invites were issued and 4 of those counties joined; 16 have not been heard from.
At the August session, feedback reported that these WislineWeb sessions have been helpful to the counties. There were 63 participants in 2 sessions. At its August meeting, this committee recommended that best practices and idea sharing be included. This worked well in August and will be a continuing feature in future Training Update WislineWeb events. The best practice suggestions provided were published in the October PTS Training Times newsletter.

For those who are interested, it was recommended that 15 minutes prior to the next session, a brief overview be conducted of how it works, instant messaging, minimizing screens, seating chart, chat tool, etc. A mini user guide could possibly be developed.

From the evaluations, some workers would like to review the documents in advance if possible because of the small print on the screen. Perhaps they could be posted on the web and available in advance. This would have to be a day or two at the most so the most recent documents are available. The WislineWeb workgroup will consider options for this.

It was noted that each session is archived and available on the Web for 2 weeks for those who are interested. We should advertise this because it's likely some are not aware of this. Although the evaluation is dated, it still would not give a clear picture of how many have accessed the archive in case they didn't fill out an evaluation. The availability of this feature will be mentioned at the next WislineWeb sessions.

Waukesha Co is setting these sessions up on a screen and inviting multiple participants. If this happens frequently in many counties it's possible that people in attendance are not being counted. Persons in the room may be more or less participative because of the environment. It's hard to know. It was decided that the subgroup would not market this concept without further discussion.

CARES Worker Web Training -General Updates

There is a workgroup looking at the CARES Security Structure.
It's possible a UserID/Systems Matrix could be developed to fold into the CARES Worker Web training. The Strategy group will take back this suggestion.

The proposed timeline that was distributed indicates the first pilot date of 1/21/05 for Pilot 1. The training for the pilot 1 counties will be more an onsite version that through the PTS Learning Center because the materials will still be in development. Their input will be necessary for the final version.

For Pilot 2 the training materials will be fully available. The training will be available 2-3 weeks on each side of the implementation date allowing workers about 2 months to complete the training. It is anticipated that the Lab component will also be available.

At Adverse Action +2 days, cases will transition to CWW and updates must then be done through CWW and not on the mainframe.

End User Feedback site is still available for viewing and overview, however, feedback can no longer be provided. This is still expected to be a prerequisite.

There will be a hiatus of new worker training. This will allow training staff time to update all the new worker materials to reflect changes related to CWW, as well as any other policy updates that have not yet be incorporated..

CARES Worker Web Training – Reviewing the approach

A document was provided that presents a picture of the overall management strategy of this project. The Implementation Group is a high level group developing the overall plan. The Training Strategy Group is led by Theresa and consists of several different sections. New Worker is led by Linda Fischer, Existing Worker by Theresa Fosbinder, Content Development is led by Jeff Esterholm, Assessment/Evaluation is led by Staci Wanty and Logistics/Support is led by Tricia Bless.

The non-core audience has not yet been defined. It was suggested that contact be made with the CARES Worker Web Marketing Subcommittee because a list which includes non-core users had already been developed to target the market audience.

Should Supervisors have the same requirements as their staff? The majority of the workgroup supports this requirement.

Staci provided some discussion about the first Assessment workgroup meeting that is scheduled for 9/29. Content details and objectives will be looked at. The first question to resolve is does each target audience need an assessment? Each module will have a review component. The number of groups needing an assessment will define how many assessments are required. IMAC did support production user ID's tied to assessment.

Changes to the Call Center are being evaluated which could provide the opportunity to include training staff as available support to the agencies on a rotating basis regardless of where they are located. Amy reports that the Call Center is now ISDN, but an Enterprise system is being researched which is similar to the Milwaukee Change Center. This would be a Virtual Call Center where the state could purchase inputs to accommodate peak times. These could be routed to anywhere in the state. Amy's request is to pilot this maybe by December. The alternative is to find additional ISDN lines but this is an unknown. The group agrees that phone contact is preferable to e-mail for immediate communication.

Train the Trainer Event – so far has not been authorized yet.

The group provided several suggestions and things to consider.

- What do we want to accomplish with this event? Hands on CWW and training, preview of training, supporting staff as we go through this process, reminder of system requirements, best practices, help counties to plan for, who need to do what.
- Who do we need to get there? CARES Coordinator, Policy Coordinator, Transfer Coordinators, Agency training contact, State training staff, Supervisors.
- Should there be multiple events on the same date at different locations to allow for a training environment?
- Big question – should "transfer coordinator" or "super user" from each county receive training with the pilot counties? Only counties directly adjacent to the pilot counties? The strategy group will need to think of some options. More discussion is necessary on this issue.

Draft Training Model: The structure of each module is Instruction, Content, Review Activity, and Evaluation. Each module may have it's own evaluation.

Different job functions will have different paths through the modules and the expectations will be explained up front. It is expected that some sort of tool will be developed to help guide agency staff through the training process. Additionally, information collected through the worker profile update project will help identify which workers need which training components.

Summary of Model

Pre-requisites are expected to require an hour to complete. There are 3 components, two of which are mandatory and one which will be optional for workers who need assistance in using the computer, the Internet, or Distance Learning. Some of these may be included in the Train the Trainer event. One of the mandatory prerequisites is the CARES Worker Web End User Feedback Site which many workers have already accessed. How to track that these persons have met this requirement hasn't been determined yet. The Strategy group will address this issue.

Module 1: Estimated time to complete, 3 hours. Required module that everyone must take. Should Component A be part of the Prerequisites? This question will be taken back to the Content Group. Component B may be an overlap of the End User Feedback information. Should it be pared down to not duplicate info? These questions will be taken back to the CWW Training Strategy group.
Module 2: Estimated time to complete, 2 hours. Also required training for everyone.
Module 3: Estimated time to complete, 3 hours. Originally designated for Client Registration responsibilities, however, after discussion it was decided that everyone should understand this piece. The TATA group recommends that all core audience workers take the Client Registration module.
Module 4: Estimated time to complete, 6-8 hours. Targeted to Eligibility Staff.
Module 5: Will be optional - estimated time to complete is 3 hours. Anyone will be able to go in and practice the concepts learned in the previous modules. The same concepts will be carried into the review labs.

CWW Content Outline: This was provided, but not discussed. The purpose of providing this document was to provide additional details of the content for each module.

Linking system ID to passing Assessment
How many attempts should a worker be allowed? After 2 the training will lock the user out and they will have an additional chance in the Lab? Would 3 before locking be better? Should this be a management decision at the local agency? The time for accessing the Lab is limited before cases become unavailable to the worker. Should this be monitored for the counties to make sure workers get to the lab before they are locked out of their cases? The Assessment Group will bring back recommendations.

RCR2b
92% of workers began the RCT2b training and of those 16% did not complete the training. Should there be any penalty for not completing this mandatory training. Currently there is no direct way to tell who did not complete the training. A list of workers who started and who completed the training is available and that list was sent to each county in mid August. One recommendation was to have counties include that information on the annual Training Report. Another was to ask Supervisors who did not take this mandatory training. What penalty could be imposed for not completing this mandatory training?

The group agreed that it would be helpful to know who did not take the training. Currently, reports from the Learning Center provide information about who did take the training. Amy Mendel-Clemens offered to have staff take the data that the Learning Center provides and match it up against other available information regarding workers in county by worker ID. This may give a better picture of who did not take the training. In the future our Learning Management System will have the ability to extract this type of data.

Next meeting: 10/19/04 at 1 Fen Oak, 9:00 to 2:00
Minute taker: Deb Solis